

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5, and 6 are amended, and claims 8-17 are added. No new matter is added by this Amendment.

An Information Disclosure Statement was filed on October 19, 2006. Applicant requests that the references be considered and an initialed Form PTO-1449 be returned to Applicant's representatives in the next Office Action.

I. Claim Objection

Claim 2 is objected to because the limitation reciting a set of third switches is still present in line 11 of the claim. Claim 2 has been amended so that "third" switches has been amended to become "first" switches.

Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

II. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Enami et al. (U.S. 5,892,493) (Enami) in view of Plus et al. (U.S. 5,113,134) (Plus). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action alleges that it would have been obvious to combine the integrated test circuit of Plus with the liquid crystal display of Enami in order to obtain a reliable, fast, and inexpensive circuit to test for circuit flaws (page 3). However, Plus provided a statement out of context of Enami. For example, the Office Action fails to allege that Enami suffers the same problems to which Plus is directed. Because the Office Action has not provided motivation as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Plus with Enami, the rejection is improper. Also, Plus is directed to testing data lines for failure (col. 3, lines 5-24), and not for testing whether sufficient precharge voltages have been properly supplied to the data lines. Therefore, the references do not suggest the claimed combination, and the Examiner is combining Plus and Enami as a result of impermissible hindsight.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Enami in view of Plus do not render obvious all of the features of independent claims 1-3, 5, and 6.

Furthermore, Plus is directed to testing lines for failure, and not for detecting whether sufficient precharge voltages have been applied to the data lines. Thus, in an effort to expedite prosecution of this application, and to distinguish more clearly over the applied references, independent claims 1-3, 5 and 6 are amended to include a plurality of pixel circuits and a data line driving circuit. Claims 1 and 3 are also amended so that the detection signal is used for testing whether a sufficient data voltage has been written in the pixel circuits. Furthermore, method claims 5 and 6 have been amended to recite the added step of using the detection signals for testing whether a sufficient data voltage has been written in the pixel circuit.

Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In addition, Plus only discloses precharge voltages $+V_1$ and $-V_1$. Plus thus fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claims 9, 11, 13, 15 and 17. Enami and Plus also fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 8, 10, 12, 14 and 16.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jeoyuh Lin
Registration No. 56,032

JAO:JL/tjx

Date: January 12, 2007

Attachment:

Request for Continued Examination

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461